

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 080 394

SO 005 035

AUTHOR Mohr, Jeremy J.; East, Maurice A.
TITLE International Studies Education in Secondary Social
 Studies Classes: A Report on a Survey of Colorado
 Secondary Schools, July 1971.
INSTITUTION Denver Univ., Colo. Center for Teaching International
 Relations..
PUB DATE Jul 72
NOTE 45p..
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Course Organization; *Curriculum Research;
 *Educational Status Comparison; Educational Trends;
 Foreign Relations; *International Education;
 Secondary Education; *Social Studies; State Surveys;
 *World Affairs
IDENTIFIERS *Colorado; Worldmindedness

ABSTRACT

The primary objective of this study was to survey the Colorado social studies curriculum at the secondary level for its inclusion of international education content. A questionnaire including a list of 31 topics was designed to determine which topics would be covered, the relative scope of coverage, frequency of treatment, and time allotted to various international topics. In the spring of 1970, the questionnaire was mailed to 1276 social studies teachers, 25% of whom returned the questionnaire. Respondents indicated the courses in which they taught each topic the most and least, and how much time was devoted to each. Data indicated that 80% of the respondents covered eight topics in at least one of the courses they taught. The frequently taught topics were more traditional, of a general nature, somewhat ethnocentric and well established in the social studies curriculum. Only half of the teachers said they covered the least frequently discussed topics which were more theoretical and newer topics. History courses were most frequently mentioned as those in which international material was presented. Limitations of the study are the applicability of the findings at the state level to the national level and stated weaknesses of the mail survey. Recommendations emphasize the need to recognize the significance of history courses as transmitters of international education information; to internationalize the history courses; and to focus on and to teach in depth topics less frequently taught. (SJM)

83
7/5
PROF. MAURICE A. EAST
Dept. of Political Science
University of Kentucky
Lexington, Kentucky 40506

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED 080394

INTERNATIONAL STUDIES EDUCATION
IN SECONDARY SOCIAL STUDIES CLASSES: A REPORT
ON A SURVEY OF COLORADO SECONDARY SCHOOLS, 1971¹

5005035
by
Jeremy J. Mohr and Maurice A. East
Center for Teaching International Relations
University of Denver
July, 1972

Since the Second World War, it has become more and more obvious that the United States is intimately linked with the rest of the world in a multitude of ways. The arms race, international commerce, scientific intercourse, the growing awareness of various forms of pollution, and resource depletion have all contributed to the recognition that Americans both affect and are affected by the rest of the world. Not surprisingly, this has caused many American educators to look for means to make students more aware of the world beyond their borders and to recognize the differences and similarities between themselves, their lives, their ideas and environment and those of others around the world.

To achieve this end, both government and private foundations have financed various forms of programs and activities. Several organizations have established programs specifically designed to improve the quality of international studies education. Among these are the Foreign Policy Association's School Services Division, the World Law Fund, the North Central Association's Foreign Relations Project, and more recently the Center for War/Peace Studies. In addition, there have been programs and activities focusing primarily on improving the teaching about various regions of the globe, e.g. The Asia Society, the Asian Studies Project, The African-American Institute, and Project

Africa. Unfortunately, recent studies have indicated that despite such efforts the amount of internationally oriented subject matter in the average high school curriculum is both small and not growing significantly.²

It was in this context that the Center for Teaching International Relations was set up in 1969 to improve the teaching of international relations, particularly at the secondary level. The Center was established in the Graduate School of International Studies at the University of Denver, giving it a solid academic base from which to operate. Its span of activities was to be regional, covering primarily the Great Plains-Rocky Mountain area. The Center was to employ several approaches: (1) conducting short in-service teacher training programs, (2) providing area teachers with a range of supporting services and materials in this field, and (3) producing and testing experimental materials for classroom use. ,

One of the first realizations reached at the Center was that there was a lack of specific empirical information about the teaching of what has been variously called world affairs, international relations, international studies and international education. It was impossible to get the basic information necessary to plan the Center's program of activities effectively. How much international content was there in the curriculum? Where did one find what there was? Which aspects were being covered most adequately and, conversely, which least?³ Because of these problems a decision was made to survey the teaching of

international studies in Colorado to give the Center some basic data with which to make decisions about how best to direct its energies.

The next major problem appeared immediately. There was no easy way to determine the absence or presence of international material in the curriculum. One method that had been used previously was to use course titles as indicators of course content. Hence, courses on World Problems, International Economics, International Relations, etc. were assumed to contain such material. But what about a course in U.S. History, Sociology, or Civics? Could we say with any certainty that these courses contained no international material?

Complicating the problem was the fact that the concept of what has been called "international education," "world affairs education," "global education," as well as other phrases is, at its simplest, a complex and often vague one. Reginald Smart in a recent article in the INTERNATIONAL STUDIES QUARTERLY suggested that there were at least eight quite distinct concepts which might be referred to by that phrase.⁴ Without denying the analytic value of his various conceptions, for our purposes a much more useful definition is that formulated by Lee F. Anderson in a U. S. Office of Education report done under the auspices of the Foreign Policy Association.

(international education)...is the social experiences and the learning process through which individuals acquire and change their orientations toward particular components of the world system.⁵

There are several aspects of this definition which should

be pointed out at this time.⁶ First, the definition is behavioral in nature. It is empirically possible to identify and measure the acquisition and change of world images (although it may not be easy!). Second, the global thrust of the definition is of central importance. We are interested in a person's images of the globe and the relationships among the elements of that system. Third, the definition in no way restricts the concept to the formal curriculum, nor does it restrict one to the school system itself. The social experiences and learning processes referred to can and frequently do take place outside of the schools. The impact of television and travel makes the "street corner curriculum" a vital aspect of international education, a factor clearly allowed for in Anderson's definition.⁷ The concept thus is multi-dimensional. It involves cognitive and affective processes as well as substantive content about the world outside our national boundaries.⁸

In the section of the survey discussed here a part of the field of international education was tapped, that part which relates to information about entities and events beyond our national borders. This delimitation is less broad than the general idea of international education and somewhat more encompassing than the narrow traditional conception of international relations. We have chosen to call this "international studies education."⁹

The reason for so limiting the scope of subject matter is basically a practical one. "Internationalizing" or "globalizing" the curriculum involves no less than a total reworking of the educational process, making students aware of the global dimensions

of every aspect of their lives. Theoretically the transformation should extend into physical education, and home economics, not to mention art, music and literature. For two reasons we decided not to extend the analysis beyond the social studies. First, given the limited amount of "internationalizing" which has occurred in the curriculum, and the small amount of systematic study of what international material is being taught, the most rewarding survey would be of international topics taught as units or courses. Second was the very real problem of developing measures. It is far easier to get feedback from a teacher about whether and to what extent he or she treats international law in a course than to measure to what extent students have changed their concepts of conflict in an international context.

THE SURVEY

The survey of international studies education in Colorado high schools was designed to answer three major sets of questions. First, what sort of international material was being presented in the schools? What topics were covered? What sorts of internationally oriented experiences were available to students? A second sort of question concerned the locale of the instruction. In what sorts of schools and classes was such material most likely to be disseminated? The final question related to the reasons for differences in the quantity and type of international studies teaching in different circumstances. What were the characteristics of teachers who presented the most of such material?

In an attempt to answer these questions, survey variables of two major types were included. First, there were several measures of international studies content within and associated with the high schools. These included the recording of the courses that teachers said had the most international content of those which they taught, the indication of which topics of international studies were treated most, the existence and strength of international relations clubs and the attendance of students at various sorts of international events. A second set of variables related to the environment of the classroom and the school, as well as to the background of the teacher. Such factors relating to the school and classroom included average income in the neighborhood, school population size, access to educational television and major libraries, the availability of university or college resources and technical teaching aids like computers and closed circuit TV. Factors relating to the teachers included such things as educational background, foreign travel and teacher opinions about certain issues of international studies education. In future reports, the focus will be on the relationships among these three clusters of variables. The present report is aimed at mapping the terrain of international studies education in Colorado high schools as a first step in planning a program of activities aimed at improving the situation, and to provide data for future comparisons.

Preparations for the survey began in the fall of 1970. Previous studies were examined. Secondary social studies teachers were interviewed informally. The literature concerning international

education was perused. In November, a pilot instrument was administered to about 35 secondary social studies teachers.

Immediately after the administration of the questionnaire the teachers were asked to discuss the clarity and relevance of the survey items and the difficulty in understanding the directions. Based on these comments both the length and the content of the questionnaire were changed. The section which related to topics in international education in particular was revised substantially not only to include more topics, but to simplify the procedures for filling it out.

Initially the intent had been to survey all secondary social studies teachers in Colorado. Through the aid of the Colorado State Department of Education's Information Systems and Certification Unit, it was possible to obtain a listing of each teacher in Colorado who taught at least one course defined as part of the social studies curriculum. This included not only the standard history, government and geography courses, but also sociology, anthropology, psychology and special courses like "Revolution", "Model United Nations", etc. More than 2600 public and parochial teachers fell into this category. Financial resources were too limited to permit the surveying of all these people. At the same time, it was felt that the population was sufficiently small that the great loss of data resulting from the surveying of a much smaller sample was not justified by any dollar saving. The compromise reached was to survey all teachers of schools which included classes for grades 10-12. This meant that the substantial majority of our population was composed of high school social

studies teachers. Included as well were some teachers of lower grades in schools covering grades 9-12, 8-12, 7-12, and a small handful of teachers teaching in K-12.

The questionnaires were mailed out in early April. In view of the length of the instrument, the lateness of the mailing in the academic year, the plethora of questionnaires which teachers receive and our financial inability for a follow-up mailing, it was imperative that every effort be made to get the maximum number of teachers to respond immediately after receipt of the instrument. Therefore, prior to the mailing an announcement of the pending survey was made in the CENTER FOR TEACHING INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS (CTIR) NEWSLETTER, a publication of news in international studies teaching for the Rocky Mountain area social studies teachers which includes a readership in Colorado of several hundred teachers. All readers who received the NEWSLETTER were asked to fill out the questionnaire and encourage their colleagues to do so. The questionnaire itself was sent with a covering letter explaining the general purpose of CTIR in the Rocky Mountain area and the importance of the survey in enabling us to do our job of helping the social studies teacher in international studies education. In addition, the senior author, in his capacity as Director of the Center, sent personal letters to about 45 social studies teachers throughout Colorado whom he knew to be highly committed to the promotion of international studies education and who had been active in programs with the Center. Of these he asked for a special effort to encourage responses from members of their social studies departments

normally least likely to reply.

In all, 1276 questionnaires were mailed. The final return was 341 questionnaires of which 328 were usable for purposes of analysis. This was 25.7% of the population. Of the 247 schools to which questionnaires were sent 148 or 59.9% of the total had at least one teacher respond.

Such a return rate is not particularly high. To a substantial degree it was the result of not being able to follow up the initial mailing with a second mailing or with systematic phone calls. Nevertheless, the results were more encouraging than might appear at first glance. The nature of the retrieval program of the State Department of Education was such that any teacher who taught as little as one social studies course, whatever else he might teach, would be included on the listing. This included many teachers whose primary concerns were not in the field of social studies education. Others, some teaching the more unusual social studies courses (e.g. psychology, sociology, anthropology), did not always see that there could be an important relationship between their courses and ISE material. A few returned the questionnaires blank with the statement that the questionnaire really did not apply to them. These factors lead the authors to conclude that it is valid to make generalizations based on the data available, even though the size of the return was somewhat less than ideal.

In the following sections of the article, we will first discuss the ISE topics which were mentioned most and least frequently and those which had the most and least time devoted to

their teaching. Based on our contact with high school social studies teachers and observations of international studies programs in Colorado schools, we will attempt to interpret the significance of these findings. Then we will discuss social studies courses as media for transmitting international material to students.

INTERNATIONAL TOPICS IN THE SOCIAL STUDIES CURRICULUM

In order to get a more exact reading of the content of international studies education in Colorado high schools, the authors prepared a list of 31 topics related to the field of international studies. The topics included (a) major areas of contemporary and historical interest to scholarly observers of the international scene, (b) the major geographical regions of the world (as topics in themselves), (c) problems of contemporary international affairs. Respondents were asked to indicate in which of their courses they taught each topic the most and to indicate approximately how much time they devoted to each. Table 1 gives a complete list of topics and responses to them.

The list of topics is influenced more by a political science perspective than by any other social science. However, an attempt was made to include topics which would tap the interests of those with economic as well as sociological, geopolitical and cultural perspectives. In general, the list attempts to reflect accurately the substance of international studies as a scholarly enterprise at this time. As a result, there is a disproportionate

TABLE 1

THE FREQUENCY OF TEACHING AND LENGTH OF TIME DEVOTED TO
THE TREATMENT OF VARIOUS INTERNATIONAL TOPICS (IN PERCENTS)

TOPIC	PERCENT OF TEACHERS TEACHING TOPIC ^a	AMOUNT OF TIME DEVOTED TO EACH TOPIC (IN PERCENTS)				
		None	Under 1 Week	1 - 2 Weeks	3 Weeks	Over 4 Weeks
1. The Making of U.S. Foreign Policy (decision-making, the organization and working of the Dept. of State, etc.)	77 ^b	17	17	31	15	14
2. International Organization (UN, League of Nations, SEC, OAS, etc.)	87	11	27	41	12	4
3. Comparative Economic Systems (Marxism, socialism, capitalism)	82	15	16	29	23	13
4. International Economics (international trade & finance)	61	39	28	20	4	5
5. New Nations (nationalism, nation-building)	76	34	21	29	14	6
6. Comparative Political Systems (Democracy, Fascism, Communism)	88	12	14	31	25	13
7. Modernization (economic development, rich nations vs. poor)	75	25	27	31	8	4
8. Foreign Aid	72	28	37	25	4	2
9. International Power Politics (sources of power, influence in world politics, political, military, national power, etc.)	76	25	20	28	16	7
10. World Regions: Latin America (history, politics, etc.)	64	36	21	23	9	8
11. World Regions: Middle East/No. Africa (history, politics, etc.)	64	36	21	21	12	7
12. World Regions: Sub-Saharan Africa	51	49	23	16	6	5
13. World Regions: Western Europe	70	30	13	20	14	18
14. World Regions: Eastern Europe and USSR	70	30	13	25	14	13
15. World Regions: Asia	72	38	15	28	18	13
16. International Law	50	50	28	14	4	0
17. Causes of War and Peace	84	16	17	31	22	8
18. Arms Control and Disarmament	71	29	35	25	6	1
19. Imperialism (colonialism, territorial expansion, economic penetration, etc.)	87	13	18	38	18	7
20. Ecological Issues (pollution, population explosion, hunger, etc.)	83	17	19	28	19	12
21. International Systems (balance of power, the bipolar world, multi-polar systems, etc.)	65	35	24	25	7	4
22. Internal Strife (revolutions, rebellions, insurgencies, counterinsurgencies, wars of "national liberation," etc.)	86	14	21	34	18	7
23. Comparative Religions and Cultures	69	31	17	26	14	10
24. The World in a Global Perspective ("Spaceship Earth," global society)	49	51	24	15	4	3
25. International Race Relations (apartheid, etc.)	67	33	31	34	6	2
26. Diplomacy (bargaining, negotiation, etc.)	73	27	26	32	6	4
27. Geographical Elements in IR (resources, boundary disputes, etc.)	69	31	30	22	9	4
28. Strategy in a Nuclear Age (balance of terror, deterrence, nuclear proliferation, etc.)	61	39	28	23	5	2
29. Alliances (NATO, SEATO, Triple Entente, Axis, etc.)	79	21	29	32	18	3
30. Public Opinion and Foreign Policy	75	25	31	28	8	3
31. The Role of the U.S. in the World (goals of U.S. foreign policy, U.S. policy toward Latin America, Asia, etc.)	81	19	21	33	15	7

^aN for all percentages is 309.

^bPercent of teachers teaching topic was obtained by subtracting the number of cases in which teachers said they did not teach a topic from the N (309) and then dividing the result by 309.

^cPercentages for the amount of time devoted to a topic do not add to 100 because the percent of responses not audible (ranging from 1 - 7% depending on the topic) were not included.

influence from political science with some smaller but significant contributions from other social sciences.¹⁰

In this section we will use the data to answer three major questions. What topics are taught most frequently? What topics are taught least frequently? How much time is spent on various topics? These questions are of particular concern to anyone interested in improving international education. We need to know where the major emphasis is now being placed by the teacher. Equally important, we need to know what areas are given short shrift. Only then will we be in a position to discover what causal relationships may exist between certain types of teaching and various characteristics of the teacher or the school. Only then will it be possible to focus efforts in materials development and other forms of institutional promotion of international studies education.

Topics Most Frequently Taught

Every respondent was asked to indicate, for each topic, in which course the topic was covered most adequately. He was also given the opportunity to indicate that the topic was not covered in any of the three courses he had listed. By using the number of times a given topic was marked as NOT being covered, we can arrive at a list of those topics taught most and least frequently. Table 2 lists the eight topics which had the fewest number of responses that the topic was not taught in any course, i. e. the eight topics which were most frequently taught.

TABLE 2
MOST FREQUENTLY TAUGHT TOPICS

Topic	Number of Times Course is Mentioned ^a	Percent of Teachers Teaching Topic ^b
"International Organization"	274	88
"Comparative Political Systems"	273	88
"Imperialism"	270	87
"Internal Strife"	267	86
"Comparative Economic Systems"	254	82
"Causes of war and Peace"	260	84
"Ecological Issues"	258	83
"The Role of the US in the World"	250	81

^aThe number of times a course was taught is calculated by subtracting the number of times respondents mentioned a course was not taught and the uncodable responses from the total number of responses (309).

^bN for all percentages is 309.

A first glance at Table 2 would seem to be encouraging. Better than 80% of the respondents indicated that these eight topics were covered in at least one of the courses they taught. There is a contemporaneity about the topics which brings a sense of satisfaction. Two of them explicitly involve the concept of comparison, one of the fundamental ideas of social analysis. "Imperialism", "Internal Strife" and "The Causes of War and Peace" have both historical and current significance as major social issues. The fact that "Ecological Issues", a relatively recent development on the national scene, have been so quickly introduced into the curriculum might be seen as evidence of the sensitivity

of planners to important new social concerns. The study of "International Organization" and of the "Role of the United States in the World" could be seen as indications that students are gaining insight not only in the problems of the world but also into some ways that nations can work together to solve those problems. Unfortunately, a more critical look at the topics listed, coupled with some knowledge about the teaching of social studies in the secondary schools leads to a much less optimistic conclusion.

Let us examine the topics in Table 2 a little more carefully. The topic "International Organization" relates to one of the major phenomena of the post-war world, namely the development of formal governmental and non-governmental institutions as a means of coordinating productive international activity and managing potential and existing conflict.¹¹ The growth of functional inter-governmental organizations, such as WHO, ILO, FAO, IBRD, and UNCTAD has had a major impact on political, economic, and social conditions all over the globe. Yet, when we consider what sorts of things are most likely to be discussed in the classroom under this topic, a very different reality emerges. Studies of the United Nations comprise the overwhelming proportion of classroom time devoted to this topic. This in itself could be excellent but the question immediately arises as to the content of the teaching that falls under this topic. In how many cases will the unit on the United Nations (if it is in fact a unit) go beyond a formal-legal description of the structure and function of the major components of the UN system? How effectively will it

discussion prepare students to reach a valid judgement as to the overall effectiveness of the UN, and therefore, to reach a decision as to whether the U. S. ought to continue to support it? Is the UN's importance to the Third World pointed out and discussed? What amount of time is given to the Specialized Agencies, the entities which are generally regarded as the most effective sectors of the whole UN system? In our experience such questions are seldom raised or answered.

There are similar problems with several of the other topics listed. The comparative study of political systems can and should be a systematic analysis of the similarities and differences in the ideas and actions of men in the process of governing themselves. Too often the major emphasis is a simplistic contrasting of democracy and authoritarianism. While there is value in exploring, for example, the contrasts between the United States and the Soviet Union, it might also be helpful to include a discussion of the theory of convergence between the U. S. and the U. S. S. R.

There is a second problem which characterizes not only some of the teaching of "Comparative Political Systems" but also a substantial amount of the published materials in the field. In a soon to be published study of various teaching materials in international education, John H. Spurgin II and Gary R. Smith found that many ostensibly comparative works were in fact not truly comparative but rather no more than a set of parallel descriptions of countries, social systems, etc.¹²

"Imperialism" (and its sub-topics "Colonialism" and "Territorial Expansion") rank high because of their venerable positions

in world and U. S. History courses. Without belittling the value of studying these historical phenomena for themselves, one wonders, for example, to what degree "Imperialism" is discussed in relation to "Neo-colonialism" and "Economic Imperialism" as a contemporary phenomenon in the Third World?¹³

In this study the topic "Comparative Economic Systems" was usually found in History courses. Often it involved a comparing of capitalism, communism, and perhaps socialism as a means of organizing the economic forces of the society. We have not been able to determine whether such discussions have gone beyond the rhetoric of Cold War propaganda and have explored problems and potentialities of differing economic systems in such matters as economic growth and ecologically sound production.

"Ecological Issues" and "The Role of the U. S. in the World" are somewhat difficult to evaluate. On the one hand if students are really learning to understand the fundamentals of ecology in a global context they are getting much of the core of the concept of man in a global system. On the other, the likelihood is that a good part of the discussion of ecology is at the local level along the lines of "What can a citizen do about the discharge of a tannery in a local river?" Similarly, there must be some ambivalence in interpreting the topic "The Role of the U. S. in the World." The nature of the topic is inherently ethnocentric, yet confronting students with policies and problems and challenging them to analyze and evaluate them can be a valuable intellectual exercise even within such limitations.

Topics Least Frequently Taught

More important to our study than which topics are taught most are those topics which are taught the least. It is these which are likely to require the greatest effort if they are to be taught effectively to the students. Table 3 lists the nine least frequently taught topics presented in Table 1.

TABLE 3
LEAST FREQUENTLY TAUGHT TOPICS

Topic ^a	Number of Times Course is Mentioned	Percent of Teachers Teaching Topic ^b
"The World in a Global Perspective"	150 ^c	49
"International Law"	154	50
"World Regions: Sub-Saharan Africa"	159	51
"International Economics"	188	61
"Strategy in a Nuclear Age"	189	61
"World Regions: Latin America"	198	64
"World Regions: Mid-East No. Africa"	199	64
"International Systems"	200	65
"International Race Relations"	207	67

^aFor the complete text of each topic see Table 1.

^bN for all percentages is 309.

^cThe number of times a course was taught is calculated by subtracting the number of times respondents mentioned a course was not taught and the uncodable responses for that item from the total number of responses (309).

Approximately 50 percent of all respondents indicated that

they did not teach about any of the first three topics in any course. Looking at these three topics more closely, this is not surprising.¹⁴ Teaching about the world in a global perspective is a relatively new approach which received its greatest impetus among teachers with the publication of Barbara Ward's book, SPACESHIP EARTH in 1966.¹⁵ Another reason for the infrequent appearance of this topic may be the argument that the thrust of the global perspective is antithetical to the prevalent United States view, and perhaps to the view of all Great Powers.¹⁶ The global perspective sees the U. S. as one entity, albeit an important one, in a social system comprised of many similar entities. Furthermore, the global perspective emphasizes that all entities are being affected and influenced by various systemic forces. This perspective contrasts rather sharply with what has recently been described as a U. S. attitude of political and social omnipotence and manipulation based on science and technology.¹⁷

To be fair to the respondents, it should be recognized that what is represented here is a perspective on world affairs and might not be considered a topic to be discussed or taught. Also, at present there is a paucity of teaching materials suitable for presenting this perspective effectively to secondary students.¹⁸ Nevertheless, it is important to note that the image of the world as a single global society is considered by many to be a crucial factor which increasingly must become a part of mankind's world view if we are to cope effectively with problems of the future.¹⁹

The appearance of international law in Table 3 probably is a reflection of the overall lack of emphasis on this subject among

international studies scholars as a whole.²⁰ Furthermore, the technical nature of the subject seems to present an insurmountable barrier to potential teachers. It is sad that a topic which is considered basic to many of the most widely recognized plans for world peace, (e.g. World Peace Through World Law, the World Federalists, etc.) is one of the least frequently taught international topics in the secondary schools.

World regions are three of the nine least frequently taught topics. It is interesting that "Sub-Saharan Africa" is not taught by 46 percent of all respondents with a comparable figure of 34 percent for the other two regions, "Latin America" and the "Middle East/North Africa". One possible explanation which might be offered for this fact is that area topics in general are not taught often in the schools. However, a glance at Table 2 proves this not to be the case. "Western Europe" and "Eastern Europe-U.S.R." rank very high among those topics to which the largest amount of time is devoted.²¹

In general this is a reflection of the ethnocentric, Western bias which pervades the entire social studies curriculum in the U. S. Unfortunately, as Howard Mehlinger has pointed out,

rigid ethnocentrism impedes the formulation of attitudes and perceptions that are required if one is to understand and begin to act upon species or planetary perceptions of human society.²³

Further Chadwick Alger argues that such a limited view of international reality gives an "inadequate sample of international activities and events which provides only a partial view of the world", making it very difficult to think effectively about the future.²⁴

"International Economics" and "Strategy in a Nuclear Age" are, like "International Law", topics which may appear exceedingly technical and complex to the teacher. And in one sense they are. But in another sense, the basic principles and concepts of these topics are no more technical and complex than those necessary for a comparative analysis of economic systems. Certain aspects of these topics can be identified and made appropriate for the secondary social studies course. Furthermore, events of the past few years: the international monetary crisis, the U. S. balance of payments deficit, and the worsening situation regarding trade and finance between developed and developing countries, offer sufficient evidence for the importance and relevance of international economics. Similarly, the recently reported SALT accord and the national discussion of its consequences for American security and world stability highlight its significance for both the U. S. and the rest of the world.

Finally, the last two topics listed in Table 3 may come as a surprise to some, especially when one is aware of the sub-headings included under each topic. Under the "International Systems" topic the following sub-headings were included: "balance of power", "bipolar world", "multipolar world". "International Race Relations" included the subheading "apartheid". These sub-headings are far from obscure and unknown topics. If there is any significance to the appearance of these topics in the table, it may be that the teacher lacks any theoretical or analytic perspective which can be used to fit these obviously important concepts into a wide context.²⁵

Summarizing, the percentage of teachers who responded that in

some course they taught the various international topics was surprisingly high for both the most frequently and least frequently taught courses. Unfortunately, before we rejoice we must recognize that on the one hand the threshold for including a topic as being taught was quite low. Virtually any coverage of a topic at all would qualify it to be included by a teacher as being taught by him. On the other hand there need to be serious questions about the depth of coverage of the topics and the quality of the treatment given.

Amount of Time Devoted to International Topics

Knowing the approximate frequency with which certain topics appear in the social studies curriculum gives us some information about the nature of the international content of secondary education. To have any idea how well a topic is covered, however, it is necessary to know at least how much time is allotted to its treatment. While there is no guarantee that four weeks devoted to a particular topic will provide an excellent understanding of the material, there is a greater chance of this occurring that if less than a week is spent on the subject.

In Tables 4 and 5 are presented the lists of topics to which the most and least time is devoted. Both tables report the percentage of all respondents indicating a specified length of time for a topic. Although there are several individual topics whose position in the lists is worthy of special comment, the most significant findings emerge when considering each of the two lists in its entirety.

TABLE 4
TOPICS WITH THE HIGHEST PERCENTAGE OF
RESPONSES INDICATING THREE OR MORE
WEEKS SPENT ON TOPIC

Topic ^a	Percent ^b
"Comparative Political Systems"* ^c	38
"Comparative Economic Systems"*	36
"World Regions: Western Europe"	32
"Ecological Issues"*	31
"Causes of war and Peace"*	30
"Making of U. S. Foreign Policy"	29
"World Regions: Eastern Europe & USSR"	27

^aFor the complete text of each topic see Table 1.

^bN for all percentages is 309.

^cThe * indicates that this topic was also one of the most frequently taught as shown in Table 2.

An examination of Table 4 shows that four of the seven topics to which most time was devoted are also topics most frequently taught. As mentioned above, three of the four topics are directly related to subject matter that has a time-honored position in the social studies curriculum, namely the causes of wars, democracy vs. authoritarianism, and capitalism versus Communism. The discussion of ecological issues is a new element in the curriculum. The frequency with which it is taught and the time devoted to it gives some indication of the adaptability of the curriculum and the teacher to important new issues.

TABLE 5
TOPICS WITH HIGHEST PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES
INDICATING UNDER ONE WEEK SPENT ON TOPIC

Topic ^a	Percent ^b
"Foreign Aid"	37
"Arms Control and Disarmament"	35
"International Race Relations"***	31
"Public Opinion and Foreign Policy"	31
"Geographical Elements in I. R."	30
"Alliances"	29
"International Economics"***	28
"Strategy in a Nuclear Age"***	28
"International Law"***	28
"International Organization"*d	27
"Modernization"	27

^aFor a complete text of each topic see Table 1.

^bN for all percentages is 309.

^c***Indicates that this topic was also one of the least frequently taught subjects as shown in Table 3.

^d*Indicates that this topic was also one of the most frequently taught as shown in Table 2.

The three topics which appear in Table 5 but are not among the most frequently taught topics need some comment. Two of the topics, "Western Europe" and "Eastern Europe-USSR", fall within the traditional history curriculum and have been traditional subjects in the study of international relations since 1945.

Table 7 indicates that these topics are taught most frequently in the World and Regional History courses and the geography courses.

"The Making of U. S. Foreign Policy", on the other hand presents a more ambivalent case. On the one hand we might assume that since the sub-headings included decision-making and the organization and working of the Department of State that this was an indication of an emphasis on more theoretical and analytic approaches to the study of political phenomena. Unfortunately, the topic is sufficiently broad that it might also be interpreted to include the very sort of non-theoretical, policy-oriented treatments of international current events that proponents of international education have been trying to deemphasize.²⁶

Comparing the topics in Tables 4 and 5 one is struck by the fact that the topics to which the most time is devoted are, by and large, of a more general nature and directly related to traditional social studies concerns. By comparison, the topics to which the least amount of time is devoted are generally more specific and more specialized areas within the broader field of international studies. To put it another way, those topics which have the least time devoted to them are ones which a teacher would be conversant with only if he were trained specifically in international studies. Those topics to which most time is devoted are topics appearing in the traditional social studies curriculum which coincidentally overlap with international studies.

Four out of eleven topics in Table 5 are those which are least frequently taught, and thus represent areas of the least concern, i.e., not only are they infrequently taught, but when

they are taught, they are covered only briefly in the curriculum. The other topics are courses which are more frequently found in the curriculum, but which are given only a short exposure.

"International Organization" is a topic of considerable interest in this regard. It is the single topic which respondents indicated was most frequently taught (see Table 2), and yet it also appears as a topic to which the least amount of time is devoted. The topic seems to have some sort of ritualistic stature in the curriculum, being recognized as important by many, but not important enough to be dealt with in any depth. This appears to support the earlier contention that the covering of "International Organization" is usually limited to a rather superficial, formal-legal description of UN structures.

SOCIAL STUDIES COURSES AND THE TEACHING OF INTERNATIONAL STUDIES TOPICS

Having determined that some topics are taught more frequently and often longer than certain other topics in international studies we have still no more than made a start. Given that some topics are taught more frequently than others we still need additional information if we are to make intelligent recommendations for improving international studies teaching. Two important questions to answer are: 1. What social studies courses are available for teaching international studies materials? 2. Which courses are the usual media for communicating information about various international topics? Using these two types of information it is possible to determine which types of courses need

changing to increase the coverage of various topics. With them we can pinpoint the areas of weakness and strength of ISE material in the overall social studies program.

The first of these two questions was answered by including in the questionnaire an item which asked that the teacher list by title up to three courses he taught which included international studies material. These responses were coded on two dimensions, their substantive focus (history, economics, political science, etc.) and their scope of coverage (international, national, local, etc.). This made possible the uniform aggregation of mentions of similar but not identical courses. Hence, courses on the history of the American Civil War and "U.S. History since 1900" would both be coded "history-national". A general course in economics would be coded "economics (unspecified)", while a course entitled International Economics would be designated accordingly.

Table 6 reproduces the coding classification used and the frequency and percentages of occurrence of responses in the various categories. As can be seen, U. S. History was most frequently mentioned as a course in which international material was presented. It was followed by World History, World Problems, International Relations/Comparative Politics, American Problems, etc. The table demonstrates several important things. First, from a quantitative standpoint history courses dominate the field. If we combine the totals of World History, International regional history and U. S. History, we have more than 50 percent of all the courses mentioned as having international content. This does not necessarily mean that U. S. History is the best vehicle for

TABLE 6

SOCIAL STUDIES COURSES WITH INTERNATIONAL STUDIES EDUCATIONAL CONTENT

DISCIPLINE	CODE	COURSE DESCRIPTION	FREQUENCY COURSE TYPE MENTIONED	PERCENTAGE OF ALL COURSES MENTIONED ^b
HISTORY	11	History (General, unspecified)	1	0.2
	12	World history, Western civilization	118	17.8
	13	World regional history, history of one or several countries	35	5.3
	14	US National history	183	27.6
	15	US Regional, State or local history	8	1.2
	16	Other e.g. Black History	12	1.8
	TOTAL		357	53.9
POLITICAL STUDIES	21	Political Studies (unspecified)	9	1.4
	22	International Relations/Comparative Politics	17	2.6
	23	International Regional, politics of another country or area	3	0.5
	24	US Government	38	5.7
	25	US local or regional (state) government	11	1.7
	26	Other	8	0.0
	TOTAL		78	11.3
ECONOMIC STUDIES	31	General Economics	17	2.6
	32	International Economics, Comparative Economic Systems	2	0.3
	33		0	0.0
	34	Economic Problems in US	0	0.0
	35		0	0.0
	36	Other	1	0.2
	TOTAL		20	3.1
GEOGRAPHIC STUDIES	41	Geography (unspecified)	16	2.4
	42	World Geography	23	3.5
	43	International--regional geography, e.g. of USSR, Africa, China	2	0.3
	44	US Geography	0	0.0
	45	US state, regional or local geography	0	0.0
	46	Other	1	0.2
	TOTAL		42	6.4
SOCIOLOGY, PSYCHOLOGY, ANTHROPOLOGY, CULTURE OR RELIGION	51	General Psychology or Sociology, Anthropology	28	4.2
	52	World Culture	8	1.2
	53	Culture of Far East, Regional cultures, etc.	3	0.5
	54	American Culture	3	0.5
	55		0	0.0
	56	Other	0	0.0
	TOTAL		42	6.4
SOCIAL PROBLEMS/ SOCIAL ISSUES SOCIAL TOPICS & AFFAIRS	61	Senior seminar, contemporary problems, modern problems	9	1.4
	62	World Problems/Current Events/Topics 70's/World Affairs	40	6.0
	63	Asian Affairs	6	0.9
	64	American Problems/Social Issues, etc./American Affairs	35	5.3
	65		0	0.0
	66	Other	5	0.8
	TOTAL		95	14.4
HUMANITIES	81		2	0.3
	82	World Literature, World Humanities	1	0.2
	83	Literature or Language of another country, region	2	0.3
	84	American Humanities, English, American Literature	0	0.0
	85		0	0.0
	86	Other	1	0.2
	TOTAL		6	1.0
OTHER SOCIAL STUDIES	91	Unspecified	15	2.3
	92		0	0.0
	93		0	0.0
	94		0	0.0
	95		0	0.0
	96	Other, e.g. Career social studies, aerospace education	1	0.2
	TOTAL		16	2.5

^a The figure in each row is the number of times that the respondents listed that type of course as one of those in which they taught significant amounts of international studies material. The N for the total number of mentions was 584.

^b The figure in each row is the amount that each course type was mentioned as a percentage of all the courses mentioned in this section. It was calculated by using the formula

$$\text{Percentage a type of course was mentioned} = \frac{\text{Number of times that course was mentioned}}{\text{Number of Respondents} \times \text{Number of Courses Each Respondent Could Mention}} - \frac{\text{Number of Blanks Recorded}}{\text{Number of Respondents}}$$

(328) (3) (18)

communicating to students about the world beyond their borders. It may mean simply that U. S. History tends to be the most accessible (one is tempted to say "unavoidable") medium for treating international issues in secondary social studies.

In addition to the obvious fact that history dominates the field of internationally oriented courses, we must also note that courses explicitly related to formal study of the field of international relations and comparative politics account for only a little over 3 percent of all courses mentioned. Even when World Problems is included, the total is less than 10 percent. If we include all courses in all subject fields other than history which have titles relating to international studies, the figure is only slightly above 16 percent.

The import of this data is by no means unequivocally clear. But for those of us who are particularly concerned with the teaching of internationally oriented material, one point is apparent. Unless there is a radical revamping of current social studies curricula there will be relatively few courses specifically designed to enable maximum communication about international events.²⁷ At the same time, the survey demonstrates that teachers have managed to use a wide array of courses to get across at least some aspects of ISE material. If, however, we are to go beyond these simple conclusions, it is necessary to delve below the level of course titles to the various topics which are or are not included in these courses.

Table 7 presents a breakdown of the relative emphasis that teachers gave to each of twelve courses as media for communicating

TABLE 7

THE FREQUENCY WITH WHICH INTERNATIONAL TOPICS WERE TREATED
IN VARIOUS SOCIAL STUDIES COURSES AS A PERCENTAGE OF
THE NUMBER OF TIMES EACH COURSE WAS MENTIONED AS BEING GIVEN

ABBREVIATED TOPIC TITLES ^a	TWELVE MOST FREQUENTLY MENTIONED SOCIAL STUDIES COURSES WITH INTERNATIONAL CONTENT ^b											
	WORLD HIST.	WORLD REGIONAL HIST.	US HIST.	IN/COMP. POL.	US GOVT.	ECON.	GEOG.	WORLD STDS.	SOCIAL- ANTHRO.- PSYCH.	WORLD PHIL.	US PHIL.	OTHER SOC. STUDIES
1. "Making U.S. Foreign Policy"	20	14	63	53	63	13	6	13	18	38	29	17
2. "International Organization"	55	17	46	47	42	13	19	22	11	48	37	14
3. "Cooperative Economic Systems"	53	34	27	47	34	76	13	43	54	28	43	14
4. "International Economics"	26	17	31	29	26	88	31	43	14	28	23	11
5. "New Nations"	59	37	27	29	18	12	44	43	25	55	26	14
6. "Cooperative Political Systems"	44	29	36	71	55	18	13	22	43	33	48	14
7. "Modernization"	42	26	28	29	21	47	50	39	43	45	31	6
8. "Foreign Aid"	19	11	48	41	34	24	19	17	11	40	40	9
9. "International Power Politics"	36	31	36	59	37	6	19	26	29	43	28	14
10. "Latin America"	50	23	26	6	8	6	69	48	11	35	14	6
11. "Middle East/W. Africa"	57	20	19	8	8	6	69	57	7	48	28	11
12. "Sub-Saharan Africa"	47	14	14	8	8	6	75	61	18	28	14	9
13. "Western Europe"	63	31	27	6	13	6	69	52	7	30	23	14
14. "Eastern Europe/USSR"	54	51	21	9	21	6	81	57	11	28	28	20
15. "Asia"	60	46	23	8	11	6	75	52	18	40	20	17
16. "International Law"	22	23	26	35	50	6	13	9	36	30	29	6
17. "Causes of War and Peace"	44	26	51	24	18	6	13	13	43	33	48	6
18. "Arms Control and Disarmament"	36	14	43	18	42	12	6	9	14	48	48	6
19. "Imperialism"	55	34	56	18	13	13	31	17	25	88	28	9
20. "Ecological Issues"	20	9	33	8	32	29	50	26	68	58	71	23
21. "International Systems"	34	23	37	47	29	6	13	11	30	20	6	6
22. "Internal Strife"	44	37	37	24	24	12	19	13	46	68	49	14
23. "Comp. Religions & Cultures"	62	26	14	12	3	6	38	52	71	28	14	11
24. "World in Global Perspective"	27	20	19	24	16	12	58	35	25	28	31	6
25. "International Race Relations"	42	17	23	35	13	6	19	35	43	45	34	9
26. "Diplomacy"	26	14	51	35	47	6	6	17	4	35	26	9
27. "Geographical Elements"	42	29	27	29	21	12	88	74	4	38	23	11
28. "Strategy"	31	11	37	29	26	6	13	4	14	33	34	3
29. "Alliances"	41	29	54	35	24	6	19	22	4	5	11	11
30. "Public Opinion & Foreign Policy"	22	14	42	35	55	6	13	17	32	5	46	9
31. "Role of U.S. in the World"	20	20	60	53	32	6	19	17	11	5	31	9
Average percent mentioned ^c	40	25	35	28	27	16	34	31	25	33	34	11
# for courses ^d	118	35	183	17	38	17	16	23	38	48	35	18

^aFor the complete text of the topics see Table 1.

^bThe twelve courses were chosen by using the data in Table 6.

^cThe "average percent mentioned" was obtained by adding the percentages for all topics and dividing by 31.

^dThe # for the courses is the number of times in this population that the particular course was mentioned as one of the three courses with international studies content taught by a teacher.

about the 31 ISE topics.²⁸ Since the derivation of this table is somewhat involved, a brief explanation is in order before discussing the data it contains. As we mentioned earlier we asked teachers to indicate what topics they taught and how much time they allotted to the teaching of each. Table 1 summarized that data. In addition we asked them to indicate for each topic in which course the topic was treated most thoroughly. All things being equal the course mentioned most frequently would be the one teachers usually taught a particular topic in. All things are not equal, however. Some courses are taught more frequently than others. To correct for this the raw frequency counts for each course on each topic were divided by the number of times each course was indicated as having been taught (taken from the frequencies in Table 6). The figures on Table 7 then are the frequencies which courses were mentioned for each topic expressed as a percentage of the total number of times that each course could have been mentioned.

Using the data in Table 7 there are several questions we can answer. First, which courses are used for teaching the widest variety of topics? We have the beginning of an answer in our averages at the bottom of the table. World History leads the group with an average of 40 percent, i. e. across the 31 topics teachers gave World History as the course in which a particular topic was taught most thoroughly an average of 40 percent of the total possible times that it could have been mentioned.²⁹ Next in order, Geography, was mentioned 35 percent, followed closely by U. S. History and World Problems. At the bottom were Economics and Other Social Studies with 15 percent and 10 percent.

How do we interpret this? Does it mean that world History as a general course type is in some way fundamentally better for teaching ISE material than other social studies courses? If we assume that all topics are of equal importance and that the course which covers the most topics does the best job, then we must conclude that World History has a definite edge. Of all 31 topics there is only one which is mentioned at a level below 20 percent. Moreover, no less than ten different topics have scores of 50 percent or better. The evidence seems pretty strong that World History is the workhorse preferred by most social studies teachers for most of the ISE topics.

That World History is somewhat more popular than other social studies courses is not occasion for scrapping the rest as devices for conveying ISE material. World History was not, after all, mentioned most frequently as the preferred course for teaching every topic. "International Law" was mentioned in only 22 percent of the cases. "The Making of Foreign Policy" in only 20 percent. Moreover, the question of quality and depth of coverage of these topics is completely unanswered. Virtually any aspect of human behavior can legitimately be studied within the confines of a World History course but the likelihood is that some will be stressed while others are given only superficial coverage. Although the other courses on the average are mentioned less frequently than World History most of them are mentioned more frequently in connection with some particular topics. "Geography", and "World Geography" are mentioned quite frequently as the best vehicles for teaching about a number of topics. Not surprisingly, the various

geographic areas and "Geographic Elements in International Relations" tended to be most frequently mentioned. But these two courses were also mentioned frequently for coverage of "New Nations", "Modernization", "Ecology", "Comparative Religion", "World from a Global Perspective", and "International Economics". They were quite "weak" in coverage of the more politically oriented topics.

International Relations-Comparative Politics tended to be strong on the political topics, quite weak in area coverage and both absolutely and comparatively strong in the theoretical topics, "Comparative Political Systems", "International Power Politics", "International Systems", yet they hardly epitomized the "ideal" internationally oriented courses. "Causes of War and Peace", "Internal Strife", and "World in Global Perspective" were treated in only a quarter of the courses. "Strategy", "Geographic Elements", "New Nations", and "International Economics" were treated in no more than 30 percent of the courses. "Imperialism" and "Arms Control" were mentioned in less than a fifth of the courses.

U. S. History and U. S. Government were both fairly wide-ranging in their coverage of topics. Both tended to be weak on other regions of the world. Both were moderately high on a number of the political topics. Generally the History course had higher percentages on all topics and fewer topics with very low scores. No other easily discernible pattern or contrast can be found between these two courses...with this exception. U. S. History appears to cover aspects of contemporary U. S. History as well or better than the U. S. government courses. "International Organization" was mentioned in 46 percent of the cases for U. S. History,

only 42 percent for U. S. Government. "Foreign Aid" was touched on in 49 percent of the history courses, 34 percent in the government. "Causes of War and Peace" was mentioned 51 percent in history, only 18 percent in government.

In the "problems" courses the World Problems courses were consistently mentioned more often than were the U. S. Problems courses. In only a small handful of cases were topics mentioned more often in the U. S. Problems. The most notable, "Ecology", was mentioned more frequently in the U. S. Problems course. In large part this was probably due to discussion of the domestic aspects of ecological issues. As we suggested earlier, discussion of the international implications of ecological problems is very new in the field. The "problems" courses live up to their names in that they tended to mention issues more than frameworks or theoretical topics. "International Organizations", "New Nations", "Modernization", "Arms Control", "Ecology", "Internal Strife", and "International Race Relations", were mentioned at 40 percent or above. Somewhat surprisingly the geographic areas were mentioned fairly frequently with the lowest reference being 28 percent of the courses for Eastern Europe and Sub-Saharan Africa. U. S. Problems has much fewer high mentions. "Comparative Economic Systems" and "Comparative Political Systems" were in the 40 percent range, as were "Foreign Aid", "Causes of War and Peace", "Arms Control", "Internal Strife", and "Public Opinion and Foreign Policy".

The Sociology-Anthropology group had respectably high percentages in a number of categories. "Comparative Economic Systems", "Comparative Political Systems", "Modernization", "Causes

of War and Peace", "Ecology", "Internal Strife", "Comparative Religion", and "International Race Relations" all were mentioned as appearing in 40 percent or more of the courses cited. At the same time the Sociology-Anthropology group was quite low in most of the politically oriented topics. "Making Foreign Policy" was only 13 percent. "Diplomacy" was only 4 percent as was "Alliances".

In summary, to the degree that the responses to these topics are a measure of the teaching of these various items, there are some substantial differences among the different types of courses. In general these differences reflect the differences in the traditional organization of subject matter in the field of social science. Politically oriented courses tend to have the political topics more frequently. Economics courses mention the economic topics most frequently. Problems courses tend to mention contemporary issues. The Socio-Anthropological group stress sociological and anthropological variables to the exclusion of political and geographic variables. History tends to span all the topics to some degree. Special courses entitled International Relations and Comparative Politics are not better than other types of courses for touching on most topics included here. They are somewhat better for topics with more specifically theoretical emphasis.

When there is a division between the study of a subject at the "World" as opposed to the "National" level, the "World" level is definitely more amenable to treating the topics included in this study. World History was about 5 percentage points higher in

coverage than was U. S. History. World Problems was about the same amount higher than U. S. Problems.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The primary purpose of the research reported in this article was to obtain a more accurate picture of the international studies content of secondary social studies courses, more specifically, we were interested in the relative coverage of various topics relating to international material and the frequency of treatment of these topics in various kinds of social studies courses. To improve the general quality of international studies education such information is necessary if we are to concentrate resources on those areas which are weakest in current coverage.

Topics

Taking all of the responses in aggregate we can see that there is a substantial range of frequency with which certain topics are treated. Some topics were mentioned by more than 85 percent of the teachers as being taught by them in some class. In the case of some of the least frequently discussed topics barely half of the teachers said they covered them in any course. While there were a number of exceptions, the more frequently taught topics and the topics which tended to be given the most time were the topics which were well established in the social studies curriculum. The more theoretical topics, the newer ideas, tended to be mentioned less frequently and given less space.

Courses

In any discussion of social studies courses which bear or can be made to bear, on ISE material we must first recognize that certain courses appear more frequently in the curriculum than others. In our study U. S. History and World History were mentioned several times more frequently than the next most frequently mentioned course (World Problems). While these proportions probably do not reflect exactly what the relative frequency of appearance of the courses are in the state of Colorado, it does at least give a rough idea. Even if international relations courses or sociology courses were the best media for communicating about international affairs, the bulk of the social studies classes in which students will contact ISE topics will be U. S. History and World History.

Certain courses easily encompass most of the topics mentioned in our study. On average, for example, World History is mentioned as the course where particular topics were presented best in about 40 percent of the cases. Contrast this with Economics in which the average was only 15 percent. On the other hand, some courses are very strongly identified with particular topics. Economics had 88 percent of the responses indicating that "International Economics" was included in their courses. The Geography courses had moderately high to high frequencies of reference to all geographic regions of the world. U. S. Government and International Relations-Comparative Politics were characterized by generally heavier emphases on the political topics. By the same token, some courses were very light in their emphases on

certain topics. The International-Relations-Comparative Politics group of courses hardly mentioned any of the geographic regions of the world while Economics courses seldom touched on more than half of the non-economic topics in the list.

Discussion

On the whole the picture of international studies education in the Colorado secondary schools is not a completely clear one. If we take the data at face value every topic is taught by at least fifty percent of the teachers in one of their courses. That can be regarded as encouraging because some of the concepts are new and others demand some specialized expertise beyond a liberal arts education with a general emphasis on social studies. World History, one of the most frequently taught social studies courses with international content, is also most frequently mentioned as the course in which international topics are covered most thoroughly. At the same time there are several other factors which should keep us from being overly optimistic in an evaluation of the development of the field.

One of the striking findings in our data was the degree to which the social studies courses were still specialized. With the notable exceptions of World History and World Problems the social studies courses tended to concentrate on certain topics to the exclusion of many others. While one might be able to make a case that the study of comparative religion is not of primary importance to an understanding of U. S. Government, it is more difficult to maintain that geographical elements have no role to play in an understanding of American history. Similarly other

topics like "International Economics", "Modernization", and "Internal Strife", to name but a few, have relevance to virtually all the courses mentioned in our last table. Yet such topics are not mentioned often outside of the courses in which traditionally they were taught.

A second problem is the lack of emphasis on the newer or more technical concepts in the field of international studies. Topics such as "International Power Politics", "International Law" and "International Systems" are not mentioned very frequently in association with the more frequently taught courses. While it is encouraging they may be covered in a high percentage of the International Relations - Comparative Politics courses (though not as high as they should be) it must be remembered that these constitute less than 3 percent of all the courses mentioned. Finally, there is the perennial problem of quality or depth of treatment. The instrument was designed with a very low threshold for inclusion of data. Any treatment of a topic, conceivably as little as part of a single lecture would still have been legitimate to cite the topic as having been included. Yet some important topics were not taught in any course by almost half of these teachers.

Recommendations

Based on the data in this survey and our experience in working with secondary social studies teachers we think several recommendations for the improvement of ISE instruction are in order. But first a few caveats about the generalizability of the conclusions are in order. First, we have no way of knowing to

what degree the responses of Colorado social studies teachers are representative of the national population of social studies teachers. We look forward to replications in other states or nationally. Second, a mail survey such as ours may involve substantial biasing as the result of self-selection of the respondents. We do not see this as a particularly difficult problem because the sample is likely to be weighted in favor of the better informed, more concerned social studies teachers. Hence, weaknesses in this group are likely to be present to at least the same degree in the general teaching population. Finally, the selection of 31 topics to represent international studies educational content cannot help being arbitrary. While we believe that it taps as wide a range of topics as could be done within the limits of the survey, there was much of the content of international studies left out. Our conclusions must be interpreted only as referring to the 31 topics and not international studies or international education in the wider sense. With these caveats in mind we make the following recommendations:

1. It is necessary to recognize that history courses are the most common means of transmitting information about international studies to the individual high school student. Moreover, we must recognize that there is little chance of any substantial change in the curriculum.
2. Given the importance of history courses every effort should be made to "internationalize" the history courses. This involves at least two related objectives. In the case of U. S. History especially, but also with regard to World History and World Regional History, there is a need to deemphasize the uniqueness and isolated quality of the events being studied. Problems of industrialization were not for the U. S. alone. "Manifest Destiny" was not a spirit unique to North America. This involves being able to bring to bear examples from the history of other countries at appropriate times in the course. Related to this is the need to sensitize teachers of history to the need for more general

concepts and analytic frameworks to provide some structure in addition to strictly chronological treatments of subject matter.

3. There is a need to focus on the topics which are less frequently taught and analyze the nature of problems. Whether it is a question of lack of materials, unfamiliarity with the subject or lack of expertise to teach it, the causes should be isolated and the appropriate remedies taken.

4. There is clearly a need to increase the penetration of topics into courses where traditionally they were ignored. This would seem to involve the dual task of making teachers in various fields more aware of the contributions of allied disciplines and at the same time, providing means to adapt existing materials to the borrower's subject.

As we stated at the outset this was a first attempt to systematically tap the international studies content of secondary social studies courses. The instrument we developed for that purpose was a relatively crude one. Our conclusions must therefore be quite tentative. Are the weaknesses that we found similar to those in other parts of the country? Are the same types of courses used to teach the same sorts of topics? Do the same sorts of courses appear in the curriculum of other states with similar frequency? We hope that future research in other states can provide the answers.

FOOTNOTES

¹The authors would like to thank Robert M. Little, Walter H. Bihler, Jr., and Edith Ruppert of the Colorado State Department of Education's Information Systems and Certification Unit for help in obtaining the list of our population. We would also like to thank John Spurgin, Cynthia Mohr, Charles Rivera, Fay Metcalf, Glen Newkirk and William Loehr for critical readings of the manuscript in its various stages of preparation. Naturally, however, we accept full responsibility for what follows.

²See among others, Harold Taylor, THE WORLD AND THE AMERICAN TEACHER (AACTE, Washington, D.C.: 1969); Elisabeth G. Kimball, A SURVEY OF THE TEACHING OF HISTORY AND SOCIAL STUDIES IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS (ETS, Princeton, N. J.: 1969).

³An examination of the Foreign Policy Association's study for the U. S. Office of Education, AN EXAMINATION OF OBJECTIVES, NEEDS AND PRIORITIES IN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION IN U. S. SECONDARY AND ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS, Final Report, July, 1969 (hereafter referred to as USOE Report) indicates the lack of information about the current status of international education in the schools. This report focuses on examining the contents of the various projects, the findings of the socialization literature, teacher education and the problems of definition of objectives. But there is little mention of the availability of, or need for, survey data on what actually is being done in the classroom in regard to international education.

Several efforts to study the nature of international education as it actually exists in schools and classrooms have come to our attention: an unpublished dissertation by Paul John Harrington, Jr., THE DEVELOPMENT OF SEPARATE COURSES IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS IN PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS, Duke University, 1970, a study begun by Otto Pick of the Atlantic Information Center, and another dissertation recently completed by Arthur L. Langerman entitled INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION IN OHIO SECONDARY SCHOOLS, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, 1972.

⁴"The Goals and Definitions of International Education: An Agenda for Discussion", INTERNATIONAL STUDIES QUARTERLY, XV, No. 4 (December, 1971), 442-464.

⁵USOE Report, p. 65.

⁶Becker and Anderson, the principal authors of the USOE Report, have discussed some of these implications more fully in their article "Improving International Education in Elementary and Secondary Schools: A Study of Research and Development Needs", INTERNATIONAL STUDIES QUARTERLY, Vol. 12, No. 3 (September, 1968), pp. 341-9.

⁷ The concept of the street corner curriculum was first brought to our attention in discussions with Lee F. Anderson. Much of the literature on international socialization processes is relevant here. See Chapter IV of the USOE Report for an excellent survey of these studies done by Torney and Targ.

⁸ For examples of the broadening conception of international studies education, compare the definition utilized herein with earlier conceptualizations, e.g. Howard Anderson, ed., *AP ROACHES TO AN UNDERSTANDING OF WORLD AFFAIRS* (NCSS, Washington, D.C., 1954); Grayson Kirk, "Materials for the Study of International Relations", *WORLD POLITICS* (April, 1949). A similar argument is found in the USOE Report, p. 17.

⁹ For another study using the same concept see James M. Becker and Maurice A. East, *GLOBAL DIMENSIONS IN U. S. EDUCATION: THE SECONDARY SCHOOL*, (New York: Center for War Peace Studies, 1972).

¹⁰ A very recent survey showing the overwhelming influence of political scientists in the International Studies Association is John H. Spurgin, II, *INTERNATIONAL STUDIES: A PROFILE OF THE FIELD* (Tentative Title), Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Denver, 1972.

¹¹ For a more general discussion of international conflict management see Inis L. Claude, Jr., *POLAR AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS*. New York: Random House, 1962.

¹² This may not always be the case. In a soon-to-be-published study of various teaching materials in international education, John H. Spurgin, II and Gary R. Smith found that many ostensibly comparative works were in fact not truly comparative but rather were no more than a set of parallel descriptions of countries, social systems, etc. *GLOBAL DIMENSIONS IN THE NEW SOCIAL STUDIES: A SURVEY OF SELECTED SECONDARY SOCIAL STUDIES PROJECTS*. ERIC Clearinghouse, Boulder, Colorado, March, 1973.

¹³ In Table 7 where the responses are broken down by courses as well as topic it appears that "Imperialism" is by far more frequently treated in the historical contexts of U. S. and World History than in the more currently oriented courses of International Relations, World Problems or U. S. Government.

¹⁴ Since Table 4 lists topics which the responses of teachers indicate are not being taught very frequently, the questions raised above about how they are being taught is less relevant.

¹⁵ New York: Columbia University Press, 1966.

¹⁶ See Maurice A. East, *STRATIFICATION AND INTERNATIONAL POLITICS*. Princeton, N. J., 1969. Unpublished PhD dissertation, pp. 10-11.

¹⁷Harold and Margaret Sprout, *ECOLOGY AND POLITICS IN AMERICA: SOME ISSUES AND ALTERNATIVES* (General Learning Press, New York: 1971), pp. 7-8.

¹⁸For an example of globally oriented materials produced for use at the elementary level, see Peggy Herring, "Developing Global Units for Elementary Schools: B. Experimental Program", *NEW DIMENSIONS* #4 "International Education for Spaceship Earth". pp. 75-83. A very recent review of some of the work in internationalizing elementary curricula may be found in Judith V. Torney & Donald N. Morris, op. cit.

¹⁹This emphasis on the global perspective is perhaps the single point which most clearly emerged out of the USOE Report. See particularly papers prepared for the project by Boulding, Alger, Kelman, North, and McClelland; all are included as appendices to the report itself.

²⁰William D. Coplin, "Report on Current Research Projected Needs for International Law Research", (a background paper prepared for evaluation and presentation in James N. Rosenau, *INTERNATIONAL STUDIES AND THE SOCIAL SCIENCES: A SURVEY OF THE STATUS OF INTERNATIONAL/COMPARATIVE STUDIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING NATIONAL NEEDS AND PRIORITIES*. International Studies Association, Minneapolis, Minnesota, June, 1971, p. 45).

²¹The findings found in the present survey are consistent with other recent studies ranking the position of various geographic regions in the curriculum. The low rankings for sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America and the Middle East were also found in a nation-wide sample of secondary students surveyed by the Educational Testing Service and in a survey of international studies education in the undergraduate curriculum by Education and World Affairs. See Kimball, op cit., and Irwin T. Sanders and Jennifer C. Ward, *BRIDGES TO UNDERSTANDING* (McGraw-Hill, New York: 1970), pp. 6-7.

²²For one of the major studies reaching this conclusion, see Commission on International Understanding, *NON-WESTERN STUDIES IN THE LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGES* (Association of American Colleges, Washington, D. C., 1964).

²³Howard D. Mehlinger, "Enlarging the International Component in the High School Social Studies Curriculum", *SOCIAL EDUCATION*, Vol. 32, No. 7, "International Education for the Twenty-first Century", (November, 1968) p. 681.

²⁴Chadwick R. Alger, "Some Problems in Improving International Education", in *SOCIAL EDUCATION*, Ibid. p. 657.

²⁵James N. Rosenau, who coordinated a team study assessing international studies today comes to a similar conclusion -- the major problem is a lack of theoretical framework to underpin the discipline. Rosenau, op. cit.

²⁶Chadwick Alger sees the preoccupation with U. S. Foreign policy as one of the major shortcomings in the study of international affairs at the high school level op cit. p. 657. But this was more because of its normally ethnocentric bias than its lack of theoretical or analytical depth.

²⁷There seems to be relatively little chance that this will happen. Erling M. Hunt noted that the National Education Association's Committee on Social Studies in 1916 made a final report which was to define the general features of the social studies curriculum at least through the time of his writing. "Changing Perspectives in the Social Studies", in Erling M. Hunt et. al. HIGH SCHOOL SOCIAL STUDIES PERSPECTIVES, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1962. 13-15. Bertram A. Masia made a similar observation about social studies in the North Central Association schools. The sequence was:

- Grade 9: Community civics
- 10: European (or World) History
- 11: American History
- 12: American social, economic and political problems.

"Profile of the Current Secondary Social Studies Curriculum in North Central Association Schools", THE NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION QUARTERLY, (Fall, 1963), Vol. XXXVII, No. 2, p. 207. An additional decade seems to have brought about no major changes.

²⁸The twelve courses were chosen as those most frequently mentioned by the teachers as being one of the courses which had international studies educational content. The data from Table 6 were used to choose the courses.

²⁹One of the reasons that the percentages are not higher in the various cases is that an increase in the percentage of any one course requires a corresponding though not necessarily equal decrease in one or more of the other percentages for the topic.